APPEAL NO. 021571 FILED AUGUST 13, 2002

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on April 10, 2002, and concluded on May 22, 2002. The hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) is not entitled to supplemental income benefits (SIBs) for the seventh quarter. The claimant appealed and the respondent (carrier) responded, urging affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

Attached to the claimant's appeal was a document not offered into evidence at the hearing. Generally, the Appeals Panel does not consider evidence not offered at the hearing and raised for the first time on appeal. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 92255, decided July 27, 1992. To determine whether evidence offered for the first time on appeal requires that a case be remanded for further consideration, we consider whether it came to the appellant's knowledge after the hearing, whether it is cumulative, whether it was through lack of diligence that it was not offered at the hearing, and whether it is so material that it would probably produce a different result. Black v. Wills, 758 S.W.2d 809 (Tex. App.-Dallas 1988, no writ); Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93111, decided March 29, 1993. We do not find that to be the case with the document attached to the appeal, which was neither offered nor admitted into evidence at the hearing. This is especially true in a case such as the one before us where the hearing officer continued the case to allow the claimant additional time to obtain documented evidence of his job search efforts.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant is not entitled to SIBs for the seventh quarter. Whether or not the claimant made a good faith job search effort is a question of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. Nothing in our review of the record indicates that the hearing officer's determination is so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986); Pool v. Ford Motor Company, 715 S.W.2d 629, 635 (Tex. 1986).

The hearing officer's decision and order are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

CT CORPORATION SYSTEMS 350 NORTH ST. PAUL, SUITE 2900 DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.

CONCUR:	Daniel R. Barry Appeals Judge
Elaine M. Chaney Appeals Judge	
Robert W. Potts Appeals Judge	